### **Description:**

The Legislative Services Office provides efficient, non-partisan support services to Idaho's citizen Legislature, carries out legislative policies so as to strengthen the Legislature's management as a separate branch of government, and assists the Legislature in carrying out its constitutional responsibilities.

#### Major Functions and Targeted Performance Standard(s) for Each Function:

- 1. Provide timely preparation of quality legislation, effective information systems to monitor preparation and progress of legislation, and quality research information to support legislative decision-making.
  - A. Provide completed drafts of bills and resolutions to requesting sponsor within five working days of receipt of request.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
97%/1,491	98%/903	99.1%/1,134	80%		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
80%	80%	80%	80%		

- 2. Develop financial information and analyses in a timely manner that allows the Legislature to establish priorities for state government through a working budget that balances state agency needs with revenues.
  - A. Draft and deliver appropriation bills to Research & Legislation within five working days after the appropriation is set in JFAC hearing.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
100%	100%	100%	100%		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
100%	100%	100%	100%		

B. Reduce number of appropriation bills returned from the House or Senate after introduction because of staff error.

Actual Results				
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	
0	1	0	0	
Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	
0	0	0	0	

- 3. Ensure legislative oversight and accountability for state agencies by providing timely financial and compliance audits to the Legislature.
  - A. Results of triennial peer review by outside auditors to assure quality audit reports.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
	Unqualified Opinion				
	Proje	cted Results			
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
Unqualified Opinion			Unqualified Opinion		

# Legislative Branch Legislative Services

B. Number and percentage of audit recommendations implemented by state agencies.

	Actual Results				
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
32/52 or 61%	58/87 or 67%	23/57 or 40%	50%		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
50%	50%	50%	50%		

### **Program Results and Effect:**

The mission of the Legislative Service's Office is to modernize the provision of professional staff services to the Legislature, to provide committees and legislators with professional staff support, to increase communication and efficiency, and enhance coordination and productivity within the Legislative Branch of government. Under the direction of the Director of Legislative Services, the office consists of the Research and Legislation section, Budget and Policy Analysis section, the Legislative Audit section, and the Network Administration section.

For more information contact Cathy Holland Smith at 334-4731.

### **Description:**

The mission of the Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE) is to promote confidence and accountability in state government through professional and independent assessment and evaluation of state agencies, programs, functions, and activities.

\*Note: Projected results were not recorded because work is dependent upon legislative direction, and previous actual results were not recorded because performance measures are new.

#### **Major Functions and Targeted Performance Standard(s) for Each Function:**

- 1. Conduct independent and objective performance evaluations to assess compliance, efficiency, and effectiveness of state agencies, programs, functions, and activities.
  - A. Number of performance evaluation projects completed during the fiscal year.

Actual Results				
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	
7	3	5	3	
Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	
*	*	*	*	

B. Number of follow-up reviews for previous evaluations completed during the fiscal year.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
n/a	n/a	3	5		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<del></del>		

- 2. Identify cost savings and opportunities to avoid unnecessary future costs.
  - A. Estimated cost savings or cost avoidance reported during the fiscal year as a result of OPE recommendations.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
n/a	n/a	\$1.1 million	\$21 million		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
*	*	*	*		

- 3. Provide useful recommendations to assist the legislature in making policy and budget decisions.
  - A. Number of bills and resolutions introduced or enacted during the fiscal year in response to OPE recommendations.

Actual Results				
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	
n/a	n/a	1	4	
	Projec	ted Results		
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	

- 4. Be responsive to the legislature's information needs.
  - A. Number of "24-hour" limited reviews completed during the fiscal year.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
n/a	n/a	4	5		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		
*	*	*	*		

B. Number of evaluation-related presentations made to the legislature (e.g., leadership, germane committees, and fiscal committees) during the fiscal year. It does not include presentations made to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee.

Actual Results					
<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>		
n/a	n/a	5	6		
	Projected Results				
<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>		

## **Program Results and Effect:**

The following examples highlight the results and effect of OPE work:

- 1. OPE received 2004 Impact Award from the National Legislative Program Evaluation Society for its evaluation, Return of Unused Medications from Assisted Living Facilities. The evaluation recommended changes to Department of Health and Welfare and Board of Pharmacy rules, which were approved by the 2004 legislature. The changes allow the return of unused medications to pharmacies, and are expected to save money for both the Medicaid program and facility residents.
- 2. Lawmakers used January 2004 OPE reports—Fiscal accountability of Pupil Transportation and School District Administration and Oversight—for making statutory changes to encourage more efficient use of tax dollars and for setting the pupil transportation budget. As part of the pupil transportation study, OPE developed a model that can be used to better understand and estimate the impact of a funding cap. Lawmakers, school district officials, and Department of Education staff have used the model, which is available on the department's website. The department is also preparing rule changes to address OPE recommendations.
- 3. The State Board of Education is working on revising its rules relating to higher education residency requirements in response to the January 2004 OPE report. The recommendations asked the Board to set uniform standards for residency determinations.
- 4. The Department of Health and Welfare's implementation of recommendations regarding the Medicaid program had contributed to cost savings or avoidance of over \$21 million to the State of Idaho. These recommendations were made in a 2000 evaluation conducted by private consultants under OPE direction.

For more information contact the Office of Performance Evaluations at 334-3880.